

Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

Comments submitted by the OHMVR Division to individual grant applicants should in no way be construed as a guarantee of successful results for the applicant within the competitive grants process or a commitment of funding. Additionally, the lack of comments by the OHV Division to any specific applicant does not ensure successful results for the applicant within the competitive grant process or a commitment of funding.

All final applications will be reviewed by the OHMVR Division. The OHMVR Division may, at its sole discretion, decrease the requested amount and eliminate activities pursuant with regulation Section 4970.07.2 (f)(1-4) and for law enforcement projects, regulation Section 4970.15.3(b)(1-5).

Please note: If multiple proposed projects are requesting funding for the same deliverable, and multiple projects are successful, only one project will receive funding for the deliverable.

General Evaluation Criteria

- #1 – Response should match the land manager’s response.
- #4 – Narrative should match the land manager’s response.
- #8b – Narrative does not support onsite education efforts.
- #8d – Response should match the land manager’s response.

Restoration	G10-07-04-R01
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #1 – Staff- “Manager” and “Accountant” positions appear inappropriate to project scope. • #2 – Contracts- Applicant may want to provide additional detail for “BLM Interlakes Stewardship agreement”. • #3 – Materials and Supplies- Line items do not appear to be related to this project. • #5 – Equipment Purchase- “ATV” does not appear related to this project. • #6 – Others- “Transportation” would be more appropriate under “Equipment Use Expenses” category. • #6 – Others- “Communications” does not appear to be a direct cost related to project. • #6 – Others- “Postage “appears excessive and/or not directly related to project. Minor office expenses are an indirect cost. • Indirect Costs – Indirect costs cannot exceed 15% of Grant Request amount. 	

Evaluation Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2 – Project appears to involve only planning for restoration and would not support selections. • #4 – Project appears to involve only planning for restoration and would not support selections. • #9 – Project does not appear to support scientific and cultural studies.

Education and Safety	G10-07-04-S01
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #1 – Staff- “Manager” and “Accountant” positions appear inappropriate to project scope. • #2 – Contracts- Applicant may want to provide additional detail for “BLM Interlakes Stewardship agreement”. • #3 – Materials and Supplies, Handouts. Applicant may want to provide additional information on all line items. • #6 – Others- “Transportation” would be more appropriate under “Equipment Use Expenses” category. • #6 – Others- “Communications” does not appear to be a direct cost related to project. • #6 – Others- “Other-office expenses”- Minor office expenses are an indirect cost. • Indirect Costs – Indirect costs cannot exceed 15% of grant request. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #4 – Narrative does not support response. Applicant listed self as a partner. • #5 – Selection ‘4x4’ is not related to project or discussed in Project Description with regard to education. • #6 - Narrative does not support response with regard to public input or dates of meetings with stakeholders. • #11 – Narrative does not support response with regard to providing of specific ATV Safety Institute and/or Motorcycle Safety Foundation training. 	